

| | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/577,790 | MORONI, ANTONIO | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Brian E Pellegrino | 3738 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Brian E Pellegrino. (3) Jamie Larmann.

(2) Daniel Scola. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 04 August 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,11,17,18 and 21.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kuwahara WO 99/04727, Schmitt '499.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Proposed amendments to the claims were discussed that included language such as "at least two naphthalene dicarboxylate derivatives" which appeared to distinguish over the art of record, but will be subject to a new search. Also discussed was the limitation of "a combination of undrawn or partially drawn radial fialments" which will further be considered in view of submitted arguments in the subsequent amendment. Also noted was product-by-process claims are not differentiated by the process, but by the product itself.